

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on December 13, 2005. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the interview, and this supplemental amendment provided to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner is requested to examine these amended claims rather than the set of claims previously filed in response to the Office action. The Examiner was notified that such amendments were likely at the personal interview.

Claims 1–38 remain in this application.

At the personal interview, the rejections of claims 1–2 and 13–14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes *et al.* (WO 97/40584) in view of Igarashi *et al.* (U.S. 5,926,749) and further in view of Nguyen (U.S. 6,253,092) were discussed.

At the interview, it was pointed out that the references do not teach the claim 1 step of “controlling a plurality of variable power amplifiers for variably amplifying the transmission signal modulated by the modulator.” Neither do the references teach the claim 13 element of “a plurality of variable power amplifiers for variably amplifying the transmission signal modulated by the modulator.”

In response, the Examiner argued that the QPSK device of Igarashi was a modulator. It was further discussed that the reference teaches further modulation, via multiplier 5, after the pair of variable power amplifiers amplify the signal output by the QPSK, whereas the invention, as shown in the example of Fig. 11, has no such further modulation. Thus, it was discussed that amending claims 1 and 13 to recite this difference would overcome the reference. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite that the signal is *not* further modulated *after* the

amplification by the variable power amplifiers. This fact is clear from the disclosure. Thus, these claims overcome the Igarashi reference.

The rejection of claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Fujita (EP 888,250 A2) was also discussed. It was pointed out to the Examiner that Claim 7 recites “controlling, using said plurality of voltage controllers, *a* power amplifier for amplifying a transmission signal via separate bias systems.” Claim 19 recites “a plurality of voltage controllers for controlling *the* power amplifier via separate bias systems.” In the Office action, the Examiner cited Fujita as teaching this limitation in Fig. 4, with items 7A and 26 representing the voltage controllers and items 24 and 25 representing the separate bias systems.

However, as was pointed out to the Examiner at the interview, it is clear from Figure 4 of Fujita that bias system 24 is connected to amplifier 3, whereas bias system 25 is connected to amplifier 5. Similarly, controller 7A is connected to amplifier 1, whereas controller 26, although not connected to any amplifier, is connected to items 24 and 25, which are connected to amplifiers 3 and 4, respectively. It was particularly pointed out that there is no single amplifier being controlled by a *plurality* of controllers, in contrast to the example shown in Fig. 11 of the application by items 13, 19 and 20, which show a single amplifier (13) controlled by two voltage controllers (19, 20). This is supported by the claim language which clearly specifies that at least one amplifier have *multiple* controllers, which is *not* suggested by any of the references.

The Examiner agreed at the interview that the cited reference does not appear to teach the cited claim language, and agreed that the rejection should be withdrawn and a new search conducted.

In addition, the Examiner suggested that amending claim 19 to specifically recite the power amplifier having “separate bias systems” would likely overcome the rejection. Claim 19 has been amended accordingly.

Finally, the Examiner agreed that the newly filed claims appear to overcome the references by nature of the limitations directed toward the control ratios.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33677.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Dated December 22, 2005